Pages 1 - 20

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE PAUL S. GREWAL, MAGISTRATE JUDGE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v. ) NO. 5:15-MJ-70142-MAG

ARMIN HARCEVIC.

Defendant. ) San Jose, California

) Friday, February 13, 2015

## TRANSCRIPT OF OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF PROCEEDINGS

FTR 1:56 p.m. - 2:19 p.m. = 23 minutes

<u>APPEARANCES</u>:

For Plaintiff: MELINDA L. HAAG, ESQ.

United States Attorney

150 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 900

San Jose, California 95113

BY: AMBER S. ROSEN

Assistant United States Attorney

For Defendant: STEVEN KALAR

Federal Public Defender

55 South Market Street, Suite 820

San Jose, California 95113

BY: GRAHAM ARCHER

Assistant Federal Public Defender

Also Present: LaDreena Walton, Pretrial Services Officer

Transcribed by: Leo T. Mankiewicz, Transcriber

leomank@gmail.com (415) 722-7045

Friday, February 13, 2015 1 2 1:56 p.m. PROCEEDINGS 3 (Defendant present in court.) 4 5 THE COURT: Mr. Rivera, whenever you're ready, you may call the next matter, sir. 6 7 THE CLERK: Calling United States versus Armin 8 Harcevic, case number 15-MJ-70142-MAG, matter on for detention hearing. 9 10 Please state your appearances. 11 MS. ROSEN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Amber Rosen for the United States. 12 13 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Rosen. Welcome back. 14 MR. ARCHER: Good afternoon, your Honor. Graham 15 Archer for Mr. Harcevic, who's present before the Court in 16 custody. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Archer, good afternoon once again. Mr. Harcevic, good afternoon, sir. 18 THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon. 19 20 THE COURT: Mr. Harcevic, we are here this afternoon 21 for a hearing on the government's request that you remain in 22 custody as this case moves forward. This hearing is something 23 we refer to here in the court system as a bail hearing or a detention hearing. 24 25 The Court's objective in this hearing is to determine

whether I can set conditions that will allow you to be released or whether, in fact, no such conditions can be set and your further detention is required.

Mr. Archer undoubtedly has much to say about this, so I'm eager to hear what he believes should be done, but because the government is the one making this request, I'll start with the government prosecutor. I'll then turn to Mr. Archer for your position.

Do you understand this, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, let's proceed. Ms. Rosen, go ahead.

MS. ROSEN: Thank you. As the Court is aware, this is a case where detention is presumed under 3142(e)(3)(C), because the crimes with which the defendant is charged are crimes of terrorism.

We believe that defendant cannot overcome the presumption because he is both a flight risk, and that's primarily the purpose, but also there's a danger posed from his release.

In making this determination, as the Court is aware, it needs to consider four things: The nature and circumstances of the offense, the weight of the evidence, the history and characteristics of the defendant and the nature and seriousness of the danger, and so I'd like to go through each of those

factors.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. ROSEN: In terms of the nature and circumstances of the offense, the charges are extremely serious. In fact, one could scarcely think of more serious offenses than supporting and providing material support to terrorists.

The indictment alleges that defendant facilitated the conspiracy by contributing personal money intended for it to be used in support of Pazara, who's one of the fighters who was in Syria and Iraq fighting in support of ISIS and Al Qaeda. It alleges that the defendant knew that Pazara and others were engaged in violent activities overseas, including conspiring to murder and maim other people.

The indictment further states that he collected money from others and sent his own money to his co-defendant Siki Hodzic, and they sent \$1,500 to Siki Hodzic, who then transferred it to Turkey, in order that it be sent to Pazara and others fighting for ISIS and Al Qaeda. It also states that Pazara told someone that he had been part of a mission which killed 11 people. In terms -- so the seriousness of the offense and the presumption, obviously, works toward detention.

In terms of the weight of the evidence, we have here an indictment, so there's probable cause has already been conclusively determined against the defendant for the offenses for which he's charged.

In terms of his history and characteristics, the defendant has no employer. He has an unstable work history. He is self-employed, sometimes as a handyman, but it's not stable work. His wife is also unemployed, and neither has any employer in St. Louis. He has no known financial assets, no property anywhere in the United States or abroad.

While he currently lives here in San Jose with his wife and children, they just moved here in January of 2015 and are renting. We believe that he left St. Louis where he had been living for several years before coming to San Jose because one of his co-defendants believed he was being investigated. So basically, when the heat was on in St. Louis is when he moved here.

He's not a citizen of the United States. He is a citizen of Bosnia, where his mother still lives. He has traveled there four times between 2002 and 2009. He was denied American citizenship based on bad moral character, and he has a brother who's known to have traveled to Syria, as well.

In terms of danger, we've based his -- the fact that he does pose a danger based primarily on the nature of the crime and the fact that there are ongoing calls from ISIS and Al Qaeda for violent activities, and we believe that this could be a triggering event, the arrest of defendant and his co-defendant. So we believe there is some danger, although, of course, we have no history of violence by this particular

defendant.

This is a very serious offense. This is not our case.

This is, as you know, charged out of the Eastern District of

Missouri. We believe we have a responsibility to deliver the

defendant to Missouri to face the charges, and so we would ask

for detention in this case.

THE COURT: All right, thank you, Ms. Rosen.

Mr. Archer, you may proceed.

MR. ARCHER: Thank you, your Honor. We're in a little bit of a tenuous position here because the report that is before the Court lists his wife as a surety and a couple of other folks that are unsure.

In the interim, I've had conversations with a number of folks, many of whom are present in the court, and I would like to acknowledge the people that are here on behalf of Mr. Harcevic. They are both close friends and also members of his mosque, as well as family members as well as his three young children, who have been making a bit of a ruckus in the courtroom prior to this case being called.

The defendant -- I'd like to address a few of the government's points first. The defendant's return with his family to San Jose was not a flight from St. Louis. He lived in St. Louis, he had previously lived in San Jose, and Pretrial Services has verified that he had -- while he came to the U.S. in 1999 in L.A., he settled in San Jose and had traveled back

to live in St. Louis for a little while with family.

He has friends and family who are here. The friends have known him for three or more years, are close friends, are with him for five or more days a week in prayer services and meetings. They are here to speak with the Court about his gentle nature as well as speak to the Court about their viability as surety, both based on their income, if the Court is interested in an unsecured bond, as well as the viability of their equity that they have in their homes, which is quite significant.

And as to the flight risk, the travel to Bosnia was to visit his mother. The travel has ceased since the birth of his first child. He hasn't left the country in a while. His passport is expired.

The government's concerns about danger, from my perspective, are entirely speculative. They are at some sort of general suggestion that there would be retaliation for the arrest of the people charged in this case. I have no idea why that would cause the father of three, with significant roots both here and in St. Louis, to suddenly flee or cause some sort of danger.

The government is correct that there has been a document filed that establishes probable cause from a grand jury in St. Louis as to some of these charges, but it's instructive of that document -- the government speaks, in some

sense, in generalities as to communications that occurred. The document does not allege that Mr. Harcevic was aware of any communications about killing anybody. There's an overt act alleged in paragraph 23 that suggests that Mr. Harcevic sent \$1,500 to another co-defendant. It's not even a transfer out of the country to a contact out of the country. It's a transfer within the country to another co-defendant.

I'm failing to see where a history of inappropriate travel would be, I'm failing to see where the danger would be, and but for some hesitation on the part of sureties who were concerned because of what has been a recent history of the interaction of their community with the FBI and others, would have stepped forward as sureties. But they're available here today if the Court would like to interview them, and they are available not only to provide absolutely rock-solid sureties based on their income and their financial situation, but also to potentially provide either cash or property sureties to permit Mr. Harcevic's release.

He has a stable home in San Jose with his wife. They are renting, but he is the father of three children. He is a handyman, has worked as a property manager at a number of properties. He's described by those that I've spoken with in this case as a gentle and caring man with a focus on charity.

So I'd be happy to address any of the concerns of the Court. I'd also be interested in the Court inquiring of any of

the potential sureties that are available today.

THE COURT: Mr. Archer, one concern I have has to do with the resources available to Mr. Harcevic outside this country should he choose to flee. Do you want to speak to that? As I understand it, his mother lives in Bosnia still, correct?

MR. ARCHER: That is correct, your Honor. His father, however, lives in St. Louis, and I believe the balance of his family lives here. He is not a man of means. The family home in Bosnia, I believe, is valued at about 20,000 American dollars. I believe we have an extradition treaty with Bosnia. I don't think that's an issue, and he doesn't have any ties to any other countries.

THE COURT: Are you aware of any history of our successfully extraditing any individuals from Bosnia?

MR. ARCHER: I have not had -- I have not had cases to that issue, but I -- he's a legal permanent resident here with an established family and ties to the community. The fact that he's -- that he emigrated from Bosnia after a war and a genocide should not suggest that he's rushing to go back there. In fact, he has not gone back there, even for pleasure, since the birth of his children. He's been here, caring for them as a father.

And to address the government's concerns about the seriousness of the case, I mean, frankly, I understand that

there's a great fear of terrorism in this country right now, and it's instructive that he's not charged in Count 2, which is the conspiracy to commit harm to people abroad.

Frankly, your Honor, I stand before the Court routinely on 10-, 15-gram methamphetamine sales that carry, you know, unbelievably higher, and they carry life terms, they carry five-year and ten-year mandatory minimums.

So for the government to stand here and say this is the most possible crime, Congress has not been shy about legislating terrorism. This is a 15-year top. I mean, it's less than a wire fraud count, it's less than a bank fraud count, it's less than a mail fraud count.

So I don't think the seriousness of the crime, especially as alleged, a \$1,500 transaction to a co-defendant, approaches what could be described as a serious and scary crime.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Archer, I'll give you an opportunity to weigh in further, but I'd like to hear from Ms. Rosen in response to what you had to say, unless you have anything further you wish to tell me now.

MR. ARCHER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Rosen?

MS. ROSEN: Thank you, your Honor. Just to reiterate, we do believe that he is a flight risk with his unstable work

history, lack of assets, lack of property, ties to Bosnia. 1 I failed to mention, he does have these two arrests, 2 one from August of 2014 which we don't even know what it was 3 for, but he's on the --4 THE COURT: I wanted to ask --5 MS. ROSEN: -- person of interest list. 6 7 THE COURT: -- you about that. Does the government have any further information about that? 8 MS. ROSEN: I do not have any further information 9 about that. So these are issues of concern. 10 11 In terms of the seriousness of the offense, Congress has said that it's a serious offense, which creates a 12 13 presumption for detention based on the seriousness of the 14 offense. Moreover, he is charged in a conspiracy to provide 15 material support to terrorists who were killing people 16 overseas. 17 So we disagree with Mr. Archer's characterization of the offense, and the probable cause determination of that is 18 significant, and the Supreme Court has said that the probable 19 20 cause findings supporting a grand jury indictment is a significant factor for purposes of determining a defendant's 21 release conditions, and that's Kaley v. United States. 22 23 So we believe that detention is appropriate here, regardless of the sureties, and we would submit it on that, 24

25

your Honor.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Archer?

MR. ARCHER: Your Honor, we have a room full of sureties that easily rebut the presumption. The presumption exists in a number of cases, including, as I mentioned before, drug transactions, as well. I mean, there's nothing about a 15-year maximum penalty case that would make this some kind of special presumption. This is the same presumption that's overcome with far less secured surety.

So if the Court has any concern about the viability of the sureties -- and I want to be clear, I'm not offering the people in the -- only in the report, though his sister is available and here as a surety, but both of the Alayleh brothers are here, Majed and his brother Mehyeddine. They are both here and have -- in terms of the sureties that I've encountered in my cases in the last, you know, a few years, this is the strongest showing that I've seen, and these are some of the most solid sureties that I've ever been able to offer to the Court, and I think the presumption is well rebutted.

Simply having a mother abroad and being a legal permanent resident, if that were the standard for detention in a presumption case, then everyone would be detained. This is exactly the scenario where I understand the government's concerns, but this is exact the scenario where we have

extraordinary community support, and both the cash and the property bond to allay the Court's concerns.

THE COURT: All right, is there anything further you wish to add, counsel?

MR. ARCHER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Officer Walton, let me welcome you again.

It is my understanding that Pretrial Services is recommending detention, is that correct?

PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, and I also understand that when you spoke to at least two of the proposed sureties, there was a hesitation. Was that hesitation largely in light of the uncertainty of the amount of the bond? Was that the issue?

provide me with the names and the contact information early this morning for some potential sureties. My concern was that none of these individuals were mentioned during my interview of the defendant. They also weren't mentioned when I spoke to his wife. She only named one good friend, and his information is included in this report.

So I felt that if there were people that were really close to the defendant and his wife, that their names would have been provided immediately, and they were not. It's just, this morning, there were several people apparently came forward

that I haven't had an opportunity to interview. So we're 1 continuing to recommend detention at this time. 2 THE COURT: All right, thank you. 3 Mr. Archer, anything further? 4 MR. ARCHER: Yes, your Honor, I can address that. 5 There was a shyness, I think -- first of all, the defendant, 6 while he does have a misdemeanor conviction for being an 7 unlicensed handyman in 2005, has never been in a situation like 8 this before in his life. His wife has never, either. She did 9 not imagine that the members of the community would be willing 10 to step forward and did not -- in fact, Mr. Harcevic was not 11 asked, do you have close friends, you know, and are other 12 13 members of your community willing to step up as sureties. So 14 I apologize for the delay in providing those sureties. 15 From my conversations with them, I am very satisfied 16 that they would provided adequate sureties. There -- a number 17 of them are present in court today, and I would invite the Court to speak with them, including Majed Alayleh, who's listed 18 in the report, as to how they know Mr. Harcevic, or if the 19 20 Court wishes to have that done by Pretrial Services, I would understand, as well. 21 THE COURT: All right. 22 23 MS. ROSEN: Your Honor, there's one other that we have --24

THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Rosen.

25

MS. ROSEN: I don't know -- I mean, we don't know who these sureties are and we don't know how much money they have and whether they're planning to put up cash or property.

Obviously, those are some of the inquiries that would be undertaken if that's the route the Court wants to do.

In terms of property, though, the only thing I would say about that is, you know, of course, this defendant needs to appear in Missouri. All of the other co-defendants have been picked up, arrested, detained and removed to St. Louis. You know, two are already in St. Louis with the other four, and so that just seems -- I don't know how long that would take, but it seems like it could delay the proceedings quite a bit, and it might be better just to let that all occur in Missouri, if that's where the Court's willing -- is intending to go, in terms of the property bond.

MR. ARCHER: I completely disagree. We can prepare a property bond by the end of next week; certainly, if the Court's inclined, perhaps even sooner, and the property's here. It doesn't make any sense, when his ties and his sureties are here, to continue the proceedings in St. Louis.

THE COURT: All right. Here's what we're going to do.

This is a presumption case, and I think it's very important to keep that in mind. What that presumption means is that our Congress has decided that in certain cases, the burden lies with the defendant, rather than the government, on the issue of

detention. Whatever the wisdom of that decision, it's a decision I have to abide by.

In light of that presumption lying with Mr. Harcevic in this case, I am not satisfied -- not yet satisfied -- that I can set conditions that would adequately assure that Mr. Harcevic appears in St. Louis in federal court for his case, and those are -- on the basis of the risk of flight particularly that I am not yet satisfied.

I should also note that given the nature of the crimes that are alleged here, I respectfully disagree with defense counsel. I do think the seriousness of the crime here is sufficient.

So on that basis, I'm going to order Mr. Harcevic detained, and remanded to the Eastern District of Missouri to face these charges.

Having said that, having said that, at this point

I don't have any information whatsoever about property or

resources. I have some good citizens of this community who are
willing to step forward, and I appreciate that, but I need more
information.

So what I would propose to do is this. I'm going to order Mr. Harcevic detained, but I'm willing to set this for a further hearing, a reconsideration of my detention order, to allow Mr. Archer and to allow Pretrial Services to vet what resources might be brought to bear, what cash assets, what real

estate assets and other assets might be presented to this 1 court. 2 3 Because I suspect that will take some time to marshal, unless counsel has a strong objection, my proposal would be to 4 set this for a further hearing not next week, but early the 5 week after, to give everyone some time to figure this out. 6 I appreciate this may impose upon our colleagues in the Eastern 7 District of Missouri, but I think it's important to get this 8 right. 9 So I would propose something like Monday or Tuesday of 10 the week after. Ms. Rosen, Mr. Archer, would that work for 11 12 you? 13 MS. ROSEN: So we're talking about the 23rd or 24th, 14 your Honor? 15 THE COURT: We are. We are. 16 MS. ROSEN: The 24th? 17 MR. ARCHER: Your Honor, the 24th is much better for 18 me. THE COURT: All right, Mr. Rivera, can you confirm the 19 Court's availability? 20 THE CLERK: Yes, your Honor, Tuesday, February 24th at 21 1:30, your Honor's available. 22 23 THE COURT: All right, and just to be clear, Officer Walton, I am most interested and appreciative in this matter if 24 25 Pretrial Services can meet with any proposed sureties and also

evaluate whether any property that might be tendered and 1 identified to Mr. Archer is suitable as a bond in this 2 matter -- as security for a bond in this matter. 3 PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: All right. And I appreciate your 5 assistance on this. 6 7 MS. ROSEN: So your Honor, I take it you're then -you're deferring your order of removal. 8 THE COURT: You anticipated my very next step. Yes. 9 So I am ordering the defendant detained, but I am not yet 10 ordering him removed. We're going to keep Mr. Harcevic here in 11 Santa Clara County until next Tuesday, that is, a week from 12 13 Tuesday. At that time I'll consider whether any sureties can 14 be presented, and depending on my decision, he'll either be 15 released here or returned to St. Louis that day, but we're not 16 going to delay it any further beyond that. 17 MR. ARCHER: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: All right, does everybody understand how 18 19 we're going to proceed? MS. ROSEN: Yes, your Honor, thank you. 20 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Harcevic, have you been 21 able to follow and understand everything I'm saying here, sir? 22 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: All right, sir, then I am returning you to 24 the custody of the marshals. You're going to be taken back to 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the main jail this afternoon, but on Tuesday the 23rd --24th of February, at 1:30, you're going to return to this very same courtroom, sir. I'll consider the issue further at that time. I suggest when you next meet with your attorney, you ask him any questions you may have. Mr. Rivera, do you need to consult with me? Mr. Rivera points out that at this point, the issue of findings has not been addressed. Mr. Archer, are you prepared to waive findings at this point? MR. ARCHER: Yes, your Honor, perhaps with the -- for the moment, I'm (inaudible) the hearing. THE COURT: All right, all right. MR. ARCHER: If that makes sense. THE COURT: Well, I will note for purposes of our record today that the findings are waived. I will note, however, if my reconsideration is -- if your motion for reconsideration, which I take it you're making --MR. ARCHER: I'm now making, your Honor. THE COURT: -- all right -- is denied on Tuesday the 24th, I will revisit the issue of findings and invite you to request them, and if necessary, I'll draft them at that point. MR. ARCHER: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Does that make sense? Okay. All right, we'll see you back here on the 24th. Have a good afternoon,

Ī						
1	sir.					
2		MS.	ROSEN:	Thank	you.	
3						2:19 p.m.
4					00	
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
L	<u> </u>					

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, Leo Mankiewicz, certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the above pages of the official electronic sound recording provided to me by the U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, of the proceedings taken on the date and time

previously stated in the above matter.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken; and, further, that I am not financially nor otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

Slot. b. Perl 03/23/2015

Signature of Transcriber Date